1	LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. M RONALD A. MARRON (SBN 175650									
2	ron@consumersadvocates.com									
3	SKYE RESENDES (SBN 278511)									
	skye@consumersadvocates.com ALEXIS WOOD (SBN 270200)									
4	alexis@consumersadvocates.com									
5	3636 4 th Avenue, Suite 202 San Diego, California 92103									
6	Telephone:(619) 696-9006									
7	Facsimile: (619) 564-6665									
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class									
9										
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT									
11	SOUTHERN DISTI	RICT OF CALIFORNIA								
12	BRYAN ROBBINS and MARVIN	Case No.: '13CV0132 IEG NLS								
13	FEIGES, on behalf of themselves, all	130 V0132 ILG NLG								
14	others similarly situated, and the general public,	<u>CLASS ACTION</u>								
15	Distriction.	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES								
16	Plaintiffs,	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF PURSUANT TO THE TELEPHONE								
17	v.	CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,								
18	THE COCA-COLA COMPANY, a	47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq.								
19	Delaware Corporation,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL								
	Defendant.									
20	Berendunt.									
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
		1								

INTRODUCTION

1. Bryan Robbins and Marvin Feiges ("Plaintiffs") bring this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of The Coca-Cola Company ("Defendant"), in negligently, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiffs through SMS or "text" messages on Plaintiffs' cellular telephones, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiffs' privacy. Plaintiffs allege as follows upon personal knowledge as to their own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by their attorneys.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiffs seek up to \$1,500 in damages for each text message in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class number in the tens of thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000 threshold for federal court jurisdiction. Further, Plaintiffs allege a national class, which will result in at least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, providing jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. Section 1332(d)(2)(A). Therefore, both elements of diversity jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA") are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.
- 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because Defendant, a Delaware corporation, is, and at all times herein mentioned was, doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California and because Plaintiff Bryan Robbins is a citizen and resident of the State of California and of this District.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff Bryan Robbins is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a citizen and resident of the State of California and of this District. He is, and at all times mentioned herein was a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (32).
- 5. Plaintiff Marvin Feiges is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a citizen and resident of the State of Maryland. He is, and at all times mentioned herein was a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (32).
- 6. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a Delaware corporation, and a "person," as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (32).
- 7. On information and belief, Defendant The Coca-Cola Company maintains offices in Atlanta, Georgia and is registered to do business in California.
- 8. Plaintiffs allege that at all times relevant herein Defendant conducted business in the state of California and in the County of San Diego, and within this judicial district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. One of the newest types of bulk marketing is to advertise through Short Message Services. The term "Short Message Service" or "SMS" is a messaging system that allows cellular telephone subscribers to use their cellular telephones to send and receive short text messages, usually limited to 160 characters.
- 10. An "SMS message" is a text message call directed to a wireless device through the use of the telephone number assigned to the device. When an SMS or "text" message call is successfully made, the recipient's cell phone rings or otherwise notes the receipt of the text message, alerting him or her that a call is being received. As cellular telephones are inherently mobile and are frequently

///

///

carried on their owner's person, calls to cellular telephones, including SMS messages, may be received by the called party virtually anywhere worldwide.

- 11. Unlike more conventional advertisements, such text messages actually costs its recipients money, because cell phone users must frequently pay their wireless service providers either for each text message call they receive or incur a usage allocation deduction to their text plan, regardless of whether or not the message is authorized.
- 12. Over the course of an extended period beginning no later than in 2012, Defendant and their agents directed the mass transmission of text messages to the cell phones nationwide of what they hoped were customers or potential customers of Defendant's Coke products.
- 13. In or around 2012, Plaintiff Bryan Robbins received unsolicited SMS or "text" messages to his wireless phone, for which Plaintiff provided no consent to receive the text messages, in an effort to promote the sale of Defendant's Coke products.
- 14. During that time period, Plaintiff Bryan Robbins received various text messages from The Coca-Cola Company; the solicitation included an advertisement to promote Coke Zero.
- 15. Plaintiff Bryan Robbins, in efforts to stop receiving text messages from The Coca-Cola Company, replied the word "STOP" to one of the text messages received; however, Plaintiff continued receiving text messages.
- 16. In or around 2012, Plaintiff Marvin Feiges received unsolicited SMS or "text" messages to his wireless phone, for which Plaintiff provided no consent to receive the text messages, in an effort to promote the sale of Defendant's Coke products.

- 17. These unsolicited text messages placed to Plaintiffs' cellular telephones were placed via an "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (a)(1) as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A) which had the capacity to store or produce and dial numbers randomly or sequentially, to place telephone calls and/or SMS or text messages to Plaintiffs' cellular telephones.
- 18. The telephone numbers that the Defendant, or its agents, called and/ or sent the text messages to were assigned to cellular telephone services for which Plaintiffs incurred a charge for incoming calls or text messages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 19. These telephone text messages constituted "calls" under the TCPA that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).
- 20. Plaintiffs did not provide Defendant or its agents prior express consent to receive unsolicited text messages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).
- 21. These telephone confirmatory text messages by Defendant or its agents violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 22. These text messages were telephone "calls" under the TCPA that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).
- 23. These text messages by Defendant or its agents therefore violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 24. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all others similarly situated ("the Class").
- 25. Plaintiffs represent, and are members of the Class, consisting of all persons within the United States who received any unsolicited SMS or text messages from Defendant or their agents on their paging service, cellular phone service, mobile radio service, radio common carrier service, or other service for

which they were charged for the SMS or text messages, through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system as set forth in 47 U.S.C. Section 227(B)(1)(A)(3) or artificial or prerecorded voice, which SMS or text messages by Defendant or its agents were not made for emergency purposes or with the recipients' prior express consent, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

- 26. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiffs do not know the number of members in the Class, but believe the Class members number in the hundreds of thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.
- 27. Plaintiffs and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through its agents, illegally contacted Plaintiffs and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using unsolicited SMS or text messages, thereby causing Plaintiffs and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiffs and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiffs and the Class members. Plaintiffs and the Class members were damaged thereby.
- 28. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiffs reserve the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.
- 29. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties

and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records or Defendant's agents' records.

- 30. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:
 - a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant or its agents placed cellular telephone SMS or text messages without the recipients' prior express consent (other than SMS or text messages made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic telephone dialing to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service;
 - b. Whether Plaintiffs and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
 - c. Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 31. As people who received at least one unsolicited telephone SMS or text message without Plaintiffs' prior express consent, Plaintiffs are asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiffs have no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.
- 32. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the

individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to individually seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

- 33. Plaintiffs have retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.
- 34. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 35. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 36. Each such text message call was made using equipment that, upon information and belief, had the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator. By using such equipment, Defendant was able to effectively send thousands of text messages simultaneously to lists of thousands of wireless phone numbers of consumers without human intervention. These text messages were made en masse through the use of a short code and without the prior express consent of the Plaintiffs and the other members of the Class to receive such text messages.

- 37. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and its agents constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 38. As a result of Defendant's, and Defendant's agents', negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 39. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 40. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the above paragraphs 1 through 34 inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 41. Each such text message call was made using equipment that, upon information and belief, had the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator. By using such equipment, Defendant was able to effectively send thousands of text messages simultaneously to lists of thousands of wireless phone numbers of consumers without human intervention. These text messages were made en masse through the use of a short code and without the prior express consent of the Plaintiffs and the other members of the Class to receive such text messages.
- 42. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not

limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

- 43. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 44. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court grant Plaintiffs and the Class members the following relief against Defendant:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 45. As a result of Defendant's, and Defendant's agents', negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs seek for themselves and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 46. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
 - 47. Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

48. As a result of Defendant's, and Defendant's agents', willful and /or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs seek for themselves and each Class member treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

1	49.	Durguent to 47 II C	C & 227(b)(2)(A) injunctive relief prohibiting							
1			C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting							
2	such conduct in the future.									
3	50.	Any other relief the	Court may deem just and proper.							
4										
5		J	URY DEMAND							
6	Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury on all issues so triable.									
7										
8	Dated:	January 16, 2013	/s/ Ronald A. Marron							
9			By: Ronald A. Marron							
10			LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON, APLC							
11			RONALD A. MARRON							
12			SKYE RESENDES							
13			ALEXIS WOOD 3636 4 th Avenue, Suite 202							
			San Diego, California 92103							
14			Telephone: (619) 696-9006							
15			Facsimile: (619) 564-6665							
16			Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed							
17			Class							
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$										
40			11							
	1		**							

Case 3:13-cv-00132-JLS-WYCL Document 1-Filed 01/16/13 Page 12 of 12

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

*		<u> </u>								
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS BRYAN ROBBINS and M all others similarly situate		ehalf of themselves		DEFENDANTS THE COCA-COLA COMPANY, a Delaware Corporation						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff SAN DIEGO (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Law Offices of Ronald A. 3636 Fourth Ave., Suite 2 (619) 696-9006		Attorneys (If Known) 13 CV0132			2 IEG NLS					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in	one Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff)			
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	ot a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only)		Incorporated or Proof Business In This	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF incipal Place			
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	o of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	3 2 3 2	Incorporated and F of Business In A	•			
Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)										
CONTRACT	TOI		FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES			
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 350 Other Personal Injury 360 Other Personal Injury A60 Personal Injury Med. Malpractice PERSONAL INJURY Product Liability 365 Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending Property Damage Product Liability S85 Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL INJURY	- y □ 69	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark		□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit				
(Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise		Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	72	LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc.	□ 861 HIA (□ 862 Black □ 863 DIW(□ 864 SSID □ 865 RSI (395 CURITY 490 Cable/Sat TV 1395 ff)	□ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration			
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PRISONER PETITIO □ 510 Motions to Vacat Sentence Habeas Corpus: □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus & Ot □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition □ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	her	IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 3 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) 5 Other Immigration Actions	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609		□ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes			
本 1 Original □ 2 Rea	te Court A	Appellate Court	Reop	ened anoth		☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	I 47 II S.C. Section	n 227 - Telephone	re filing (Consun	Do not cite jurisdictional s ner Protection Act ;	tatutes unless di 5 5:552	iversity):				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	N D	EMAND \$		CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND:						
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER				
DATE 01/16/2013		SIGNATURE OF AT		OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY										
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	OGE			